THE HONOURABLE SHRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION No. 14511 OF 2007

Dated 10th July, 2007

Between:

A.Jogender Singh

…Petitioner

And

Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation,
represented by its Special Officer, Tankbund,
Hyderabad.

…Respondent.

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner, owner of a building property bearing No. 9-1-34/9B, situated at Langar House, Hyderabad, seeks a writ of mandamus to declare the action of the respondent in depriving the petitioner of frontage of his property for the purpose of road widening without due process of law, as illegal.

It is the case of the petitioner that he is the owner of the property bearing No.9-1-34/9B, in an extent of 833 sq. yards, situated at Langar House, Hyderabad. It is stated that among the family settlement between the petitioner and his brothers, the said property has fallen to his share. It is the grievance of the petitioner that though no part of his property is notified under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, the respondent has visited on 5.7.2007 and is taking steps for demolition of a portion of the structures covered by the mulgies.

However, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent stated that as of now, there is no proposal for widening the road or to demolish the property of the petitioner bearing No. 9-1-34/9B, situated at Langar House, Hyderabad. It is further stated that if there is any need for taking possession of any part of the structures of the petitioner, they will follow due process of law.

Except the apprehension of the petitioner, there is no basis for the allegations made by the petitioner in view of the submission of the learned Standing Counsel that there are no proposals as on today to take any part of the property of the petitioner for the purpose of road widening. Moreover, it is stated that if any property of the petitioner is required for the purpose of road widening, the

respondent-authorities will follow the due process of law.

Therefore, placing the statement of the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent on record, the writ petition is closed. No costs.

_____

10-7-2007

R.SUBHASH REDDY,

VR